

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 19 and 28 are currently amended. Claims 10, 18 and 25 are hereby cancelled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 First Paragraph:

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph alleging that it is unclear that the square sub-sampled digital image comprising a square data set is meant to describe the sub-sampled digital image being a square with sides that are multiples of two. Claim 28 is amended herein to recite “wherein said sub-sampled digital image is square ~~comprises a square data set~~ having sides that are multiples of powers of two.” The specification recites “typical Fourier transformed techniques restrict the size of the input image to powers of 2, [such as] 4 X 4, 16 X 16, 256 X 256 . . . in an illustrative embodiment . . . the image is sub-sampled to fit into a size of 256 X 256.” (p. 18, line 29 – p. 19, line 5). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 as amended is thereby supported in the specification and clearly describes the claimed invention in a manner and terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 Second Paragraph:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner pointed out that claiming “a set of one or more filters” renders the claim indefinite because incremented angles also claimed require at least two filters. Accordingly, claim 1 is amended herein to recite “applying a set of ~~one or more~~ oriented filters . . .” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 should no longer be considered indefinite.

Regarding the Examiner’s rejection of claims 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Examiner is unsure how a single filter applied to a single image results in a set of filtered images. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 19 each contain the same

typographically error by reciting "applying a set of oriented filter." Claims 12 and 19 are amended herein to recite "applying a set of oriented filters." Claims 12 and 19 should no longer be considered indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 12 and 19 also cures the lack of antecedent basis that the Examiner objected to in claims 12 and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Allowable subject matter:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 10, 18 and 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Rather than amending claims 10, 18 and 25, Applicants currently amend independent claims 1, 12 and 19 to include the allowable subject matter of claims 10, 18 and 25, respectively. Applicants respectfully request that claims 10, 18 and 25 be cancelled. Applicants submit that the claim amendments submitted herewith overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 103:

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the dependent claims (claims 1, 12 and 19) as currently amended contains subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is allowable in view of all of the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19-30 are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19-30 presently pending in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguish over the art of record. Allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the

Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Please charge any deficiency as well as any other fees which may become due at any time during the pendency of this application, or credit any overpayment of such fees to deposit account No. 50-0369. Also, in the event any extensions of time for responding are required for the pending application(s), please treat this paper as a petition to extend the time as required and charge deposit account No. 50-0369 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,

1-25-05
Dated:

Brian L. Michaelis
Brian L. Michaelis
Reg. No. 34,221
Customer No. 21710
Attorney for Applicants

BROWN RUDNICK BERLACK ISRAELS LLP

Box IP, 18th Floor
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Tel: 1-617-856-8369
Fax: 1-617-856-8201